

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### ***- Amendments -***

Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims be amended as indicated in the accompanying amended page(s), in which:

- Claims 1 and 7 to 8 are amended; and
- Claim 5 is cancelled.

By these amendments, claims 1 and 7 - 8 are pending. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by these amendments.

### ***- Remarks -***

#### **35 USC §103(a)**

Independent claim 1 is rejected under §103(a) over XP-002353310 to Petit et al. in view of Shintani et al. (US 5,875,034), and further in view of Fellegara et al. (US 2001/0015760). Applicant amends claim 1 to better distinguish over this combination.

Amended claim 1 clarifies that the printed instruction card has printed thereon an array of dots representing a programming script. Further, the linear image sensor is clarified as for converting the array of dots into a data signal.

Additionally, claim 1 is amended to further recite an input buffer connected to both the area image sensor interface and the linear image sensor interface. The input buffer receives the pixel data from the area image sensor and the data signal from the linear image sensor. The input buffer is further connected to the VLIW processor to effect communication of the pixel data and the data signal to the VLIW processor.

Finally, claim 1 is amended to still further recite that the one-chip microcontroller decodes the data of the data signal into the programming script and executes the programming script represented by the array of dots on the pixel data.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Petit et al., Shintani et al., and Fellegara et al. fail to teach or suggest the invention of amended claim 1. It is further submitted that the above combination of references in further combination with Mackinlay

et al. (US 5,502,577) also fails to teach or suggested the invention of amended claim 1. Applicant's reasoning is as follows.

None of Petit et al., Shintani et al., Fellegara et al., and Mackinlay et al. teach that the card has printed thereon an array of dots representing a programming script.

With reference to Fellegara et al., the "film cartridge identification" is neither an array of dots, nor does it represent a programming script.

With reference to Mackinlay et al., the form and the marks entered/drawn on the form are also neither an array of dots, nor do they represent a programming script. Applicant acknowledges that the form and the markings on the form provide a way to input data, but such data is not a programming script. The data input via the form is likely provided to a program or programming script, but that data is not itself a programming script. In Mackinlay et al., a script/program acts on the data provided via the form, but the form does not itself provide or define the script/program. Applicant believes this distinction to be particularly important.

It follows from the above that none of the references teach or suggest the linear image sensor for converting the array of dots into a data signal, nor that the one-chip microcontroller decodes the data signal into the programming script and executes the programming script. Applicant believes that the above differences distinguish claim 1 from the cited combination of reference.

Moreover, Applicant traverse the assertion of the present rejection that Fellegara et al. describe an input buffer to which both the area image sensor interface and linear image sensor interface are connected.

The rejection refers to element 68 as the linear image sensor interface, and refers to element 70 as the area image sensor interface. The rejection goes on to contend that element 72 (particularly the FIFO buffer in element 72) corresponds to the claimed input buffer. Finally, the rejection asserts that this FIFO buffer in element 72 is connected to both element 70 and element 68. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In paragraph [0044], Fellegara et al. describe that the FIFO buffer receives data from element 70. However, apart from this description, Fellegara et al. is otherwise silent as to what else the FIFO buffer does. Importantly, Fellegara et al. does not disclose that the FIFO buffer receives the cartridge identification code from a different sensor (i.e. a linear image sensor). The description at paragraphs [0073] - [0074], describing the manner in which the cartridge identification code is also silent as to the code, when obtained via a different sensor, being also stored in the FIFO buffer.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is mistaken in asserting that Fellegara et al. disclose an input buffer connected to both the area image sensor interface and the linear image sensor interface, and which effects communication between the VLIW processor and the two sensor interfaces.

Other Amendments

Claims 5 is cancelled. Claims 7 and 8 are amended to be consistent with the amendments made to claim 1.

The Examiner's further consideration of the claims is earnestly sought. Applicant thanks the Examiner in advance for his further consideration, and looks forward to word of official communication in due course.

Very respectfully,



---

Kia Silverbrook, Managing Director

Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd  
393 Darling Street  
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia  
Email: [pair@silverbrookresearch.com](mailto:pair@silverbrookresearch.com)  
Telephone: +612 9818 6633  
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762